



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Strategic & Long Term Issues Committee

Meeting Summary

May 22, 2002

North Augusta Community Center

North Augusta, SC

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Strategic and Long Term Issues (S<I) Committee held a budget workshop on May 22, at the North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, SC. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Integrated Priority List (IPL) criteria process development, the new budget tools and hear public comment. Those in attendance were:

CAB Members

Mel Galin*

Bill Vogele*

J.G. Long*

David Adcock*

Jimmy Mackey

Bill Willoughby

Wade Waters

Stakeholders

Melinda Holland

Bill McDonell

DOE/Contractors

John Pescosolido, DOE

Jim Buice, DOE

Steve Baker, DOE

Gerri Flemming, DOE

Becky Craft, DOE

Teresa Haas, WSRC

Clay Jones, WSRC

Gary Percival, WSRC

Jim Moore, WSRC

* Members of the S<I Committee

** Note: Carolyn Williams and Jean Sulc, members of the S<I Committee, were not able to attend.

Mel Galin, Chair, welcomed those in attendance and asked them to introduce themselves.

Integrated Priority List Criteria Process Development and New Budget Tools

Jim Buice, DOE, stated that Clay Jones, WSRC, and he would be giving the presentation. Mr. Buice reviewed the background of CAB participation with the Top-to-Bottom review and the Cleanup Reform Appropriations (CRA) initiatives. He stated that from these activities a draft Performance Management Plan (PMP) has been developed. This PMP gives an overall approach for accelerating cleanup at the site. Roles, responsibilities, milestones and schedules appear in the PMP. The purpose of the PMP is to reduce risk and accelerate cleanup. This may result in increased funding for the site. A Red Team (individuals from DOE Headquarters (HQ) and other sites) came to SRS to review the PMP and provide recommendations. A series of meetings is currently being scheduled to take the draft PMP to the public for their review and comment.

During discussions it was stated that this PMP is a multi-year vision of accelerating cleanup at SRS. The PMP has an approach for long-term stewardship. The final draft is due August 1.

Mr. Pescosolido mentioned that the site is developing a model to determine the end state at the site. At this time, the site can't be specific on certain end states such as for the F-Canyon.

Mr. Buice stated that a Letter Of Intent had been signed by the site Manager, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and DOE-HQ. The Letter Of Intent documents the commitment to accelerating cleanup.

The site has received guidance for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 through 2008 budget. The due date for comments to DOE-HQ is June 17. The new guidance does not require an IPL. However, the IPL is an excellent tool and the site will continue to use it internally and for a communications tool to the public. However, dollars will not be on the IPL. Mr. Buice said that the Senate added \$200 million to the \$800 million Cleanup Reform Appropriations request. Mr. Buice said that while the IPL is a good tool, there are several others that are used at SRS and DOE HQ levels. They are the Peer Review category/driver categories and the DOE-HQ Environmental Management (EM) crosscut categories. Both of these were briefly explained.

Clay Jones suggested that since the CAB requested this meeting on the IPL criteria it would be worthwhile to determine what the CAB is expecting out of the meeting. At the end of the presentations, the expectations could then be reviewed to see if everything was covered. Those in attendance suggested they were expecting the presentation to cover the following items:

- Risk Comparison
 - How is it considered in the new process
 - Explicit way of taking risk out for comparison of activities.
- Has CRA initiatives caused re-thinking?
- Concern over use/understanding of the term risk.
 - How quantified?
- Risk Definition
 - Medical
 - Programmatic
 - Environmental Delta
 - Health Delta

-----> Experience base

- Why is the IPL not required at DOE-HQ?
- Integration / coordination of Peer Review Project List (PRPL) and IPL?
- Risk = Consequence x Probability

David Adcock stated that if risk is mentioned in presentations, that individual using the term should give the definition of the risk being used and the scientific basis for it. Mr. Galin suggested that information on risk could be a subject at the CAB Educational Retreat.

Mr. Jones said that with the old process, the traditional IPL received a lot of emphasis. It is a good decision making tool and a big part of the budget submittal. The Peer Review categorization was also a part of the old process. The IPL was used to draw a cut line to determine funded and unfunded activities. The problem was that you could only walk up and down the list. While it was the best method used at the time, it had its limitations. The Consortium for Risk Evaluation and Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) noted problems with the IPL. Therefore, the IPL was reengineered to include three perspectives: Risk, Business and Stakeholders.

The new IPL process has been reviewed and updated over the past two years. The SRS IPL system was reviewed along with other processes. Criteria were developed along with specific process recommendations. Subject matter experts and "Expert Choice" software was used to develop criteria scoring. The new process features multi-attribute framework, multi-year consideration, along with the three areas of perspectives listed above.

In addition to the reengineered IPL, Jessie Roberson initiated the Top-to-Bottom review recommendations with an emphasis to improve DOE's contract management, adopt agreements with regulators for accelerated, risk-based cleanup strategy, align and revamp DOE's internal processes, re-deploy, streamline or cease activities not consistent with the cleanup and closure mission, and apply innovative approaches to cleanup activities.

For the FY 2003 budget preparation, there are several tools to be used rather than just the IPL. Those tools include: DOE-HQ budget guidance, Stakeholder Input, Strategic Plan, Cleanup Reform Appropriation, Top-to-Bottom Review, Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB) recommendations, EM priorities, the IPL, PRPL and National Programs.

The CRA opened a new \$800 million account for initiatives that can reduce risk, reduce cost, accelerate cleanup, and involve the sites, regulators and the community. DOE has also committed to add another \$300 million if required by worthwhile site proposals.

The IPL will not be submitted this year for the FY 2004 budget submittal but is being replaced by the PRPL. SRS will continue to use the IPL as a planning tool. The IPL is required to categorize work for the PRPL input. The IPL in this new process will do away with the dollar numbers for the relative activities.

The PRPL will be at the Project Baseline Summary (PBS) level unlike the IPL that was at a lower level. Each work activity will be categorized into one of seven Peer Review Categories and one of ten Compliance Drivers and summarized at the PBS level. It will provide a standardized process for reviewing and categorizing EM work being performed at each site. It will also be used extensively throughout the budget process to communicate and defend/justify the site budget requests. A copy of the Peer Review Categorization Matrix was reviewed and explained.

Another deliverable for the FY 2004 budget is the EM-1 Budget Category Breakdown as requested by Jessie Roberson. This deliverable will detail established pathways for closure and/or cleanup, waste, material and facilities disposition operations, "Caretaker" activities, DOE-Wide environmental services and missions.

Jim Buice said that when you look at the different models there are a lot of similarities. The important activities on the IPL are the same important activities on the PRPL.

Mr. Jones stated that if anyone is interested in going into the details of the reengineered IPL with the new criteria, a one-on-one could be scheduled as requested.

Mel Galin requested that this new process be reviewed with the full CAB. Melinda Holland, CRESP, suggested that the presentation be sent to the CAB before the meeting so they could read the information and be more prepared during the meeting. Simple examples should be used to help the CAB understand the system.

Mr. Buice reviewed the revised schedule for the SRS budget process. Because the CRA funding has not been determined, the previously discussed schedule has been moved out. Both the Strategic Plan and the Comprehensive Plan will be pushed out a month or so. Mr. Pescosolido said that the site strategic guidance would be sent to the CAB before the draft Strategic Plan is developed to get stakeholder input. The timing should be in the late August time frame. J. G. Long requested an electronic copy of the revised budget schedule. This revised schedule will be forwarded to members of the S<I Committee.

Mr. Galin requested that copies of these minutes be distributed to the full CAB so they could be aware of these changes. He also requested that Jim Sanders, the CAB ex-officio representative from Georgia be kept in the loop on such things as the PMP and the meetings being scheduled.

Bill Vogeles requested a hard copy of the PMP.

With no further comments, Mr. Galin adjourned the meeting.

Meeting handouts may be obtained by calling 1-800-249-8155.